



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,326	02/26/2002	Ikuo Uratani	NIT-332	3456

7590 03/20/2006

Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,326

Applicant(s)

URATANI ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Per Applicant's Request for Continued Examination:

*Claims 1-14 have been cancelled. Claims 15-29 are new.
Claims 15-29 are pending.*

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/6/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 15-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Blumenau et al* (US 6,988,130).

a. **Per claim 15**, *Blumenau et al* teach a computer system comprising:

- a storage system having a plurality of logical units defined and having one of said logical units as a command device (col.7 lines 1-11, col.9 lines 46-59, col.31 lines 13-21, col.35 lines 28-45);
- a host computer that manages one or more first logical units of said plurality of logical units, and that does not manage one or more second logical of said plurality of logical units (col.11 line 59-col.12 line 7, col.12 lines 35-48); and
- an application included on said host for controlling coupling operations of said first logical units, said application capable of issuing instructions for coupling operations to said command device (col.12 lines 35-53, col.21 line 41-col.23 line 8, col.33 lines 26-col.34 line 6; provision for host controller to control coupling operations to logical units);
- wherein the storage system adds extended logical unit numbers used in coupling to a response of an inquiry command from said host to a specified logical unit, each said extended logical unit number including a connection port, a target ID, and a logical unit number (col.9 lines 24-38, col.9 line 60-col.10 line 2, col.13 line 30-col.14 line 11);
- whereby the application obtains a list of extended logical unit numbers corresponding to said first logical units managed by the host (col.9 lines 35-43, col.13 lines 3-36, col.15 line 35-col.16 line 24, col.21 lines 34-53, col.24 line 64-col.25 line 29 ; list mapping the LUN to the corresponding hosts);
- wherein the application rejects a request of a coupling operation directed to logical units other than said first logical units corresponding to the extended logical unit numbers on the list, thereby inhibiting coupling operations directed to any logical units not managed by the host (col.12 line 66-col.13 line 13, col.27 line 32-col.28 line 57, col.30 lines 3-8; application denies access and coupling to logical units for any logical units not assigned to and managed by the hosts).

b. **Claims 20 and 24** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 15 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 16**, *Blumenau et al* teach the computer system of claim 15 wherein said coupling operations are for copying said first logical units (col.41 lines 23-43).

d. **Claim 25** is substantially equivalent to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Per claim 17**, *Blumenau et al* teach the computer system of claim 15 wherein the command device is shared between a plurality of ports (col.9 lines 38-57, col.22 line 21-col.23 line 5, col.33 lines 30-54).

f. **Claim 26** is substantially equivalent to claim 17 and is therefore rejected under the same basis

g. **Per claim 18**, *Blumenau et al* teach the computer system of claim 15 wherein said host is capable of issuing a command for the coupling operation only via the application (col.23 lines 27-45, col.31 lines 30-34).

h. **Claim 27** is substantially equivalent to claim 18 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

i. **Per claim 19**, *Blumenau et al* teach the computer system of claim 18 wherein the command of the coupling operation is written into the command device as data, and the storage system processes the data written into the command device for performing the coupling operation (col.33 line 5-col.34 line 46).

j. **Claims 21-23** are substantially equivalent to claims 18 and 19 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

k. **Per claim 28, *Blumenau et al*** teach the computer system of claim 24 wherein the command device is a logical device (col.17 lines 10-35, col.31 lines 13-21, col.33 line 49-col.34 line 6, col.35 lines 28-45).

l. **Per claim 29, *Blumenau et al*** teach the computer system of claim 24 wherein said extended logical unit information includes a connection port, a target ID, and a logical unit number (col.9 lines 24-38, col.9 line 60-col.10 line 2, col.13 line 30-col.14 line 11).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Burton et al (6,633,962), DeKoning (6,671,776), Ito et al (6,947,938), Blumenau et al (6,839,747) and (6,799,255).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds



KRISTIE SHINGLES
PATENT EXAMINER